

Treasury Department,

BUREAU OF THE MINT.

Washington, D. C., December 18th, 1884.

Sir:

I transmit herewith, copy of an enclosure to the communication of the Kansas City Smelting and Refining Company to which, your attention, was called, in my letter of the 12th inst. Supposing it to be a copy from your records, it was not included.

Very respectfully,
Horatio C. Burdick,
Director

A. Soudon Snowden Esq.,
Supt. Mint,
Philadelphia.

The Mint of the United States,

AT

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.,

Assay Department, Dec 15, 1884

Sir:

I have delayed replying to the letter of the Director respecting a complaint from the Kansas City S. & R. Co., until I could have the bars reassayed.

Cuttings from different parts of the bars, show some variation in fineness, as is to be expected in large masses of silver. But in no case can we get a higher title than 983 and in most instances 982 would be the highest that it would be perfectly safe to report upon.

It is not improbable that a slightly better return in fineness would have resulted from the melting of the bars. But I questioned whether the losses by melting would not overbalance the possible increase of fineness ~~from~~^{over} inside cuttings near the surface.

The assay of one bar by Platt of New York, is wholly inadequate as a criterion for the seven bars sent to us. We frequently find the Platt bars several thousandths below their stamp - as in the case of a lot received November 1st in which the bars

The Mint of the United States,

AT

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.,

Assay Department,

188

2

varied from $996\frac{1}{2}$ to 999.

It is noteworthy that the complainants find no fault with ~~the~~ our return upon their gold which exceeded both ~~their~~ ~~own~~ and Platt's assays. It is hardly fair to assume that we are right in the gold because we give them more than they ask, and wrong in the silver because we give them less than they ask. The Mint has a right to claim that the rule shall work both ways.

As I said before, it was solely to protect the Smelting Company from the possibility of undue loss by melting, that I had the assays made from cuttings; and I still think the Kansas City Company are the gainers.

Very Truly

Jacob B. Eckfeldt
Mayor

Hon A. Linden Lumsden
Sept. 5th

copy.

Kansas City, Mo. Dec. 8th 1884.

Hon Horatio Burchard Esq.

Director of the Mint,

Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir;

We have had a good many differences on shipments of silver and dove bullion which have caused us considerable loss.

These losses we feel have been unjust to us in a majority of cases and have been due to inaccuracy or carelessness on part of employers in the assay office and mint.

We have before us returns which are evidently wrong, as you will doubtless see from enclosed papers.

In calling these matters to your attention we would respectfully ask that the matter be thoroughly investigated and that you kindly inform us of the result of such

investigation. Our shipment no 671 dove bullion consisting of 8 bars, cast at the same time, out of the same furnace, was divided, bars one to 7 inclusive going to the Mint at Phila. and bar no. 8 to Chas. Platt of 4 Liberty Place N. Y. Our fineness as stamped on the bars was 985.8 silver fine, 5.25+ gold fine. The returns from the Mint dated Phila. Nov. 25th, which we herewith enclose, show fineness 981.1-2 to 983 silver fine. The one bar no. 8 sent to Platt yielded 986 silver fine and 5.3 gold fine. The discrepancy in this case is unusually large and it seems to us that the circumstantial evidence is very strong against the returns from the Mint. Please return enclosed documents.

Yours Truly

Wm Murray
Pres.

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 133

[Letter One:]

Treasury Department,
Bureau of the Mint,
Washington, D.C.,
December 18, 1884

Sir:

I transmit herewith copy of an enclosure to the communication of the Kansas City Smelting and Refining Company to which your attention was called in my letter of the 12th instant. Supposing it to be a copy from your records, it was not included.

Very respectfully,
Horatio C. Burchard
Director

A. Loudon Snowden, Esq.
Supt. Mint,
Philadelphia.

[Letter Two:]

The Mint of the United States,
At Philadelphia, Penn.,
Assay Department,
December 15, 1884

Sir:

I have delayed replying to the letter of the Director respecting a complaint from the Kansas City S. & R. Co., until I could have the bars reassayed.

Cuttings from different parts of the bars, show some variation in fineness, as is to be expected in large masses of silver. But in no case can we get a higher title than 983 and in most instances 982 would be the highest that it would be perfectly safe to report upon.

It is not improbable that a slightly better return in fineness would have resulted from the melting of the bars. But I questioned whether the losses by melting would not overbalance the possible increase of fineness over inside cuttings near the surface.

The assay of one bar by Platt of New York, is wholly inadequate as a criterion for the seven bars sent to us. We frequently find the Platt bars several thousandths below their stamp – as in the case of a lot received November 1st in which the bars varied from 996 ½ to 999.

It is noteworthy that the complainants find no fault with our return upon their gold which exceeded both theirs and Platt's assays. It is hardly fair to assume that we are right in the gold because we give them more than they ask, and wrong in the silver because we give them less than they ask. The Mint has a right to claim that the rule shall work both ways.

As I said before, it was solely to protect the Smelting Company from the possibility of undue loss by melting that I had the assays made from cuttings; and I still think the Kansas City Company are the gainers.

Very Respy.
Jacob B. Eckfeldt
Assayer

Hon. A. Loudon Snowden
Supt. &c &c

[Letter Three:]

Copy

Kansas City, Mo.
December 8, 1884

Hon. Horatio Burchard Esq.
Director of the Mint,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir;

We have had a good many differences on shipments of silver and dove bullion which have caused us considerable loss. These losses we feel have been unjust to us in a majority of cases and have been due to inaccuracy or carelessness on part of employees in the assay office and mint.

We have before us returns which are evidently wrong, as you will doubtless see from enclosed papers.

In calling these matters to your attention we would respectfully ask that the matter be thoroughly investigated and that you kindly inform us of the result of such investigation. Our shipment No. 671 dove bullion consisting of 8 bars, cast at the same time, out of the same furnace, was divided, bars one to 7 inclusive going to the Mint at Phila. and bar no. 8 to Chas. Platt of 4 Liberty Place N.Y.

Our fineness as stamped on the bars was 985.8 silver fine, 5.25+ gold fine. The returns from the Mint dated Phila. Nov. 25th, which we herewith enclose, show fineness 981, 1-2 to 983 silver fine. The one bar no. 8 sent to Platt yielded 986 silver fine and 5.3 gold fine. The discrepancy in this case is unusually large and it seems to us that the circumstantial evidence is very strong against the returns from the Mint. Please return enclosed documents.

Yours Truly
Wm. Munz
Prest.